

#16  
5-2709  
PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

the Application of

Tsuyoshi TAMURA

Group Art Unit: 2674

Application No.: 09/911,409

Examiner: K. Nguyen

Filed: July 25, 2001

Docket No.: 110195

For: RAM-INCORPORATED DRIVER, AND DISPLAY UNIT AND ELECTRONIC  
EQUIPMENT USING THE SAME

**STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW UNDER**  
**37 C.F.R. §1.133 AND MPEP §713.04**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RECEIVED

MAY 25 2004

Technology Center 2600


Sir:

On May 24, 2004, Applicant's representative conducted a personal interview with Examiner Nguyen discussing the March 5, 2004, Office Action and the patentability of the rejected and objected to claims. As indicated by Examiner Nguyen in the Interview Summary (copy attached), no response to the withdrawn March 5 Office Action needs to be filed. However, this paper is submitted in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.133 and MPEP §713.04 as Applicant's statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action and as Applicant's statement of the substance of the interview.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 9, 10 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,329,973 (U.S. 973), and objects to claims 18 and 19 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claim 1 is an independent claim, and claims 2, 9, 10, 17-19 and 35 all ultimately depend from claim 1. In the interview, Applicant's representative argued that U.S. 973 fails to teach at least the following feature of claim 1: "a RAM that stores the still-image data and the moving-image data transferred through the first and second bus lines." Examiner Nguyen agreed, and stated that claim 1 is not anticipated by U.S. 973. Applicant's representative also argued that the dependent claims, which include all of the limitations of claim 1, are also not anticipated by U.S. 973. Examiner Nguyen agreed and stated that claims 2, 9, 10, 17-19 and 35 are not anticipated by U.S. 973.

In the Interview Summary, Examiner Nguyen stated that he has withdrawn the March 5 Office Action, and the rejection and objection therein. Examiner Nguyen also stated in the Interview Summary that Applicant need not respond to the withdrawn Office Action, and that a new Office Action will be provided in due course. Accordingly, this statement is a full and complete response to the March 5 Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Philip A. Caramanica, Jr.  
Registration No. 51,528

JAO:PAC


Attachment:

May 24, 2004, Interview Summary

Date: May 24, 2004

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

Interview Summary



Application No. 09/911,409	Applicant(s) TAMURA, TSUYOSHI	
Examiner Kevin M. Nguyen	Art Unit 2674	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Kevin M. Nguyen. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.
- (2) Phil Caramanica. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 24 May 2004.

Type: a)  Telephonic b)  Video Conference  
c)  Personal [copy given to: 1)  applicant 2)  applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)  Yes e)  No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

RECEIVED

MAY 25 2004

Technology Center 2600

Claim(s) discussed: 1-19.

Identification of prior art discussed: Akimoto et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f)  was reached. g)  was not reached. h)  N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Agreed to withdraw the rejection filed on 03/05/2004. Akimoto does not teach the claimed limitation "a RAM that stores the still-image data and the moving -image data transferred through the first and second bus line." No response the applicant is needed. Another office action will be provided in due course .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

## Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

### Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

### Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

#### Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

#### 37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recodation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recodation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recodation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recodation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recodation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

### Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.